DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 217 010 SP 020 192

AUTHOR Newman, Carol; And Others
TITLE Exploring a Teachers' Center's Support of School-Based Coordinating Teachers.
INSTITUTION Charlotte-Mecklenburg Public Schools, Charlotte, N.C.; Far West Lab. for Educational Research and Development, San Francisco, Calif.; North Carolina Univ., Chapel Hill.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Mar 82
NOTE 78p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Delivery Systems; Educational Cooperation; Elementary Secondary Education; Inservice Teacher Education; *Linking Agents; Participant Satisfaction; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; *Role Perception; School Districts; Staff Development; *Teacher Centers; Use Studies

ABSTRACT

The Charlotte-Mecklenburg (North Carolina) school system has a locally funded teacher center, the Teaching Learning Center (TLC), and school-based advisors called Coordinating Teachers (CTs), who provide nonevaluative instructional and curriculum support to teachers. The possibility of linking the TLC and CTs more closely to provide increased support for teachers was investigated by a research team from the University of North Carolina and school practitioners. An in-depth study of the functions and activities of the TLC was conducted through surveys and interviews with CTs as well as through TLC usage reports. Seven research questions determined: (1) how CTs used the TLC to support their work; (2) to what extent the CTs' patterns of use of the TLC was affected by or affected the patterns of use by the teachers they served; (3) how much knowledge CTs had regarding resources and programs available from the TLC; (4) how CTs' perceptions of support systems available to them affected their patterns of use of the TLC; (5) how CTs' perceptions of their own roles in the local school affected the ways in which they used TLC resources; (6) how CTs' use of the TLC affected their assessments of the center; and (7) how the data collected by the previous questions may be used to enable the TLC to provide more effective support for CTs. Responses to these questions are presented in tabular form accompanied by narrative discussions. The implications of the study's findings for teacher centers and school advisors are discussed. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
George W. Noblit
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED217010

SP 020 192

Exploring a Teachers' Center's Support of School-Based Coordinating Teachers

by

Carol Newman
Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools

George Noblit
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Phillip Schlechty, Prime Research Consultant
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

March 1982

The research upon which this report is based was performed under a contract from the Program for Research on Experienced Teacher Centers, Far West Laboratory of Educational Research and Development funded by the National Institute of Education. This report does not necessarily reflect the views of the Far West Laboratory or the National Institute of Education. The authors gratefully acknowledge Diane Adams for her assistance in all phases of the research, Dwight Hare for his assistance in instrumentation and data analysis, and William Johnston for his assistance in data processing.

As is amply apparent, the 1980's promise to be an era of fiscal austerity for government services including the public schools. The service enhancement and expansion drives of the 60's and 70's seem now lost. Certainly many can view this loss with regret for it seems that we had learned some lessons about how to appropriately deliver services and how to maintain and improve delivery systems. In public education, we have learned much about teaching the disadvantaged, the handicapped, and the slow learners. But of equal importance we have learned that for quality instruction to take place, teachers also need support. This support can come in many fashions. Both teacher centers and advisors to classroom teachers often are proposed as two effective support services. That is not to say, of course, that each has been without its detractors. Nevertheless, teacher centers and advisors are both important support systems.

The austerity of the 1980's seems to threaten both of these support systems. Both require sufficient funding for the services to be available to the entire teaching force of any system. Even with federal funding neither seems to have the monies to be fully available to the teaching forces in most school systems, and certainly with the loss of funding now in process, it seems unlikely that either will be able to adequately support teachers.

Yet there is one possibility. It may be possible to link teacher centers and advisors so that sufficient support is available to the teachers. This study was designed to examine this possibility.

The Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools (CMS) have both a locally funded teacher center, the Teaching Learning Center (TLC), and school-based advisors called coordinating teachers (CTs), who provide non-evaluative instructional and curriculum support. Thus, CMS was an excellent research site to examine the possibility of linking teachers' centers and advisors to "multiply" the effect of teachers' center resources and programs.

To guide the study, seven research questions were posed:

1. How do coordinating teachers use the Teaching Learning Center to support their work

with teachers in building level units?

2. To what extent does variability in the coordinating teachers' patterns of use of the resources of the Teaching Learning Center seem to affect or seem affected by the patterns of use by the teachers in their local buildings?
3. How much variability is there in the knowledge coordinating teachers have regarding the resources and programs available from the Teaching Learning Center and how does this variability affect patterns of use?
4. How do the coordinating teachers' perceptions of the types of support systems available to them, in addition to the Teaching Learning Center, affect their patterns of use of the Teaching Learning Center?
5. How do the coordinating teachers' perceptions of their own roles in the local school building affect the ways in which they use the resources of the Teaching Learning Center?
6. How does the coordinating teachers' use of the Teaching Learning Center affect the assessments he/she makes of the center and to what extent are these assessments based upon direct experiences?
7. How can the data gained from the previous questions be used to deepen understanding and to provide new directions for teachers' centers to more effectively support and meet coordinating teachers' (and other resource teachers') need and through them the needs of classroom teachers?

These questions enabled the research team to understand the nature of the coordinating teachers' role, how teachers and coordinating teachers use the TLC, what the coordinating teachers know about the TLC, and how they and their teachers assess the TLC. However, the research questions also demanded a rather complex research design, employing both a collaborative research approach and multiple research methodologies.

from the TLC (a factor which the research team and the area and school CTs who had been involved to this point both believed to be a salient factor in TLC usage). The interviews were conducted, after training, by teams of UNC personnel and area CTs during the summer of 1981.

Third, based on the results of the TLC usage study and the interviews and the analyses of both by the area CTs and the research team, we designed a survey instrument to be administered to all school CTs. After review and critique of the instrument by area CTs and the review panel of school CTs, the final instrument was distributed by area CTs to each school CT who then returned it anonymously to their area offices.

The TLC usage study and surveys were coded by teams of university and CMS personnel, key punched and computer processed. The interviews were audiotaped and transcribed. These were coded and analyzed by the research team and the area CTs.

These data and analysis processes seem sufficient to respond to the research questions. However, it is important to note the limited number of cases for the survey (73 were returned out of 85 sent for a response rate of 85%) and that the TLC usage study was in no way random or complete. As a result, it was inappropriate to use parametric, inferential statistics to analyze these data. Rather they are descriptive data and when used in conjunction with the qualitative, interview data, they become part of the interpretive analyses. In sum, then, this is not a positivistic survey study, but an interpretive, qualitative study. Thus, the ideas, not the data, may be generalizable to other settings, but almost certainly not without contextual differences.

The Study

Any research should lead to different understandings than those which existed prior to its being conducted. Certainly that is the case with this study. The research questions led us to new understandings and new or reformulated questions, many of which we incorporated as we proceeded. However, to explain to the reader the events

and processes which led to these changes would take more space than we have here and probably would be of more interest to epistemologists than to everyday researchers and practitioners. Thus we have elected to present our analyses in terms of the original seven research questions and within the analyses for each question to reveal the changes in thought that resulted. The first six questions are closely data-based and thus will be discussed in this section of the report. The seventh question is the important question, asking what does all this mean and deserves separate attention. We will address this question as the conclusions drawn from this study. However, before we address the research questions let us first describe the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools, the Teaching Learning Center, and the coordinating teachers' role in the CMS.

Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools

The Charlotte-Mecklenburg School System has an enrollment of approximately 73,000 students, making it the 30th largest public school system in the United States. It is the largest public school system in North Carolina. Charlotte-Mecklenburg is a consolidated system of both city and county schools, governed by a nine-member Board of Education. Pupils are assigned to schools under a 1969 court ordered pupil assignment plan for desegregation. Students' school assignments are determined by their residence address.

As a decentralized system, CMS is composed of eight areas. Each area consists of the elementary and junior high schools which "feed" into one of the ten senior high schools, with two senior high schools in two of the areas. Each area is headed by an Area Superintendent who is in a line position and maintains operational authority for the schools in his/her area. The Area Superintendent and his/her support staff, including an Area Coordinating Teacher for instruction and curriculum, are housed in an area center which is easily accessible to principals and teachers.

Research Design

The research problem represented a significant departure from usual social and educational research. Even though many researchers speak of prediction as their goal, they are limited to data collected in the past from which they infer to the future. While the problems inherent in such research are legion, our research required an even more difficult task. That is, we were not simply concerned with predicting the future in some statistical fashion. We wanted to investigate the possibility that something might be feasible. Obviously, then, our inferences needed to "anticipate" what could be constructed out of some existing state of affairs (Shackle, 1966). Thus our research problem required that we know with some reasonable certainty what was the existing state of affairs both for the TLC and for the CT role, and then shift to a more speculative mode of reasoning about what could be constructed from both of those.

Many traditional researchers would have shunned this approach. Yet in doing so, they seemingly would have negated the possibility of applied research (Mannheim, 1936; Noblit, 1981), for this type of problem is precisely that which practitioners might solve (Shackle, 1966). They cannot be content with knowing what is, and limited by it. Rather they must transform what is into something else. Undoubtedly, the requirements of practice necessitate more creative research than is typically found in social or educational research (Mannheim, 1936; Patton, 1981).

The research problem then demanded a methodology that departed from usual research. First, it required an "interactive", collaborative research approach, one that teamed university-based researchers with school system practitioners and negated the distinction as both became research-practitioners. While collaborative research approaches are not as rare as they once were, it seems that many do not lead to the transformation of roles that this project seemingly demanded. To us, it seemed essential that the study be guided by co-principal investigators: one from the university and one from CMS. Thus both co-principal investigators needed to become researchers and both become practitioners,

at least to the extent that a year of concerted collaboration would enable. In addition, the data collection and analysis processes teamed university and school system personnel. Interviewing teams consisted of both area coordinating teachers (the school system had eight "areas", each with an area CT that supported the school CTs which we were studying) and university faculty and/or graduate students. The analysis of the data, both qualitative and quantitative, was similarly conducted by school system and university personnel working together. The area coordinating teachers, the co-PIs and graduate students were all involved. The survey instrument was designed by the co-PIs and graduate students, reviewed and critiqued by a panel of school coordinating teachers, area teachers, and the principal consultant. This final report similarly is the result of collaborative review and critique.

The research problem demanded more than a collaborative approach, however. Given that our problem was not that of statistical inference but that of anticipation, we needed interpretive data and analyses that enabled an understanding of how the coordinating teachers perceived their roles and the TLC, and how they are limited either by the expectations of others or by structural, fiscal or physical conditions in their use of the TLC. Thus we needed both qualitative and quantitative data.

First we thought it essential to conduct a study of the TLC using documentary data. We reviewed quarterly and annual reports and had TLC staff construct detailed retrospective listings of CT usage. We also designed a reporting system that asked teachers and CTs to indicate the purposes of each visit (see Appendix A for a copy of this instrument). Data from this reporting/sign-in system were collected and analyzed twice, once in May 1981 and again in August-September 1981. The August-September sign-ins had more respondents and thus will be used in this report.

Second, we developed a semi-structured interview schedule (see Appendix B) which was reviewed and critiqued by the area CTs and a review panel of six school CTs. The revised interview schedule was used with twenty-six school CTs from two areas that were geographically "close" and "far"

It is important to understand that within CMS there is a structural differentiation between line and staff personnel. The line personnel, e.g. Area Superintendent, Principals, etc., are responsible for implementation of programs and system operations.

There is a strong emphasis on staff development within CMS with significant support from the Superintendent. A principal was quoted as saying, "Every Superintendent has to leave his mark and this Superintendent's mark is going to be staff development." Staff development opportunities for teachers include an incentive pay program, graduate level courses offered at the Staff Development Center, a consortium certificate granting program, monthly workshops and seminars. Leadership for workshops and seminars often comes from within the system.

The Teaching Learning Center

The Teaching Learning Center was established in August 1976 as part of a major organization plan within CMS. Located near downtown Charlotte in an old school building which has been converted into the Staff Development Center, the Teaching Learning Center functions as one component within the Department of Human Resources and is one of many staff development options available in a system of over 4200 professional staff.

While some of the programs and staff in the Teaching Learning Center have change over the past five years, the main premise and philosophy of the center has remained the same. The center operates on the belief that teachers know what their professional and personal needs are and should be given the support and opportunities to determine how these needs are met.

In addition to serving classroom teachers, the center staff also responds to coordinating teachers, student-teachers, principals, aides, graduate students, community organizations and parents. Individuals using the center are always viewed as both learners and teachers. The staff, which consists of two professional positions and one aide position, works with individuals in the areas of curriculum

development, materials design and production, classroom management and organization and general problem solving. The staff also serves as a broker putting teachers and other participants in touch with one another to share strengths, skills, common interests and needs. Whenever appropriate, community resources and agencies are used as referrals in assisting teachers in their search for special resources. Central level curriculum specialists are regularly called upon or referred to in the process of helping teachers meet specific curriculum needs.

While the Teaching Learning Center's main thrust involves working on a voluntary, informal and individual basis with teachers, the staff also responds to groups with special interests or needs, school building staffs and community group requests. These responses usually take the form of orientation sessions, mini-workshops, special programs and integrating curriculum sessions. Specific examples of this aspect of the TLC program include: Intermediate Teachers' Support Projects, Reading Comprehension sessions with junior high teachers, teachers' and parents' materials-making sessions, orienta[illegible] sessions for student-teachers, school staffs and graduate course participants; and curriculum development sessions with secondary special education classroom teachers. These activities and others similar to them are most often jointly planned by the Teaching Learning Center staff and a coordinating teacher or appropriate resource person. Through these collaborative effots, the center staff responds to specific school staff needs while at the same time modeling an advisory approach to staff development.

Since the Teaching Learning Center's inception, an Advisory Board consisting of approximately twenty-four elementary, secondary and coordinating teachers has served on a voluntary basis. The TLC Advisory helps guide the programming and resources of the center and also develops and helps implement long-range plans for the center on a yearly basis. The Advisory has a teacher chairperson and meets on a monthly basis. For the past five years, the Advisory has planned and participated in a day-long retreat to assess the previous year's development and to make plans for the coming year. At several of these retreats, the [illegible]cher[illegible]

Center Exchange has provided support by helping to bring a facilitator from another teachers' center to work with the staff and teachers attending the retreat.

Some of the projects the TLC Advisory has initiated include the creation of a bookstore within the center, the development and design of a lounge area for the center and an on-going program for teachers who are new to the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools. Last year, in support of one of the Superintendent's goals, the Advisory Group also sponsored a Creative Writing Project which resulted in a special book of students' writing which was then distributed to all CMS schools. In addition to the items already mentioned, Advisory members have also assisted in staffing the center in times of special need. Their contribution to the center is invaluable both as advocates and assessors of the programs and resources.

The material resources of the center include:

Curriculum displays

Teacher and student-made materials

Competency materials

Make-and-take centers (bookbinding, filmstripping, puppetry, N.C. crafts)

Recycle materials

Laminating, thermofax, duplicating and mimeograph machines

Free samples of Scholastic magazine (K-12)

Bookstore with materials on elementary and secondary levels and curriculum areas

Reading and math skills boxes

Cardboard carpentry construction for classroom furniture, materials and organizational structures

Teachers' resource bank for teachers to support one another and share ideas or interests

Multifunctional materials display

Samples of newly published materials and books for preview

Resource idea books

Handouts developed by teachers and TLC staff relating to curriculum, classroom organization and management

Bookbinding machine, button machine, letter-making machine

The uniqueness of the Teaching Learning Center stems from the leadership style of the director, Deane Crowell, and the ways in which the Center has consistently been supported by local funds. Ms. Crowell, Associate Superintendent for the Department of Human Resources and the director of the center, has provided the kind of support and direction that has helped other central administrative staff to better understand the Teaching Learning Center's purposes for existing. Her attention to administrative matters concerning the center has freed the two professional TLC staff members to provide direct services and more concentrated personal attention to teachers, coordinating teachers and other center participants. This style of operating has enhanced both credibility and development of the center's programming.

Visitors from other teachers' centers have particularly responded to the Teaching Learning Center's integration into the total staff development program of CMS while still maintaining its own identity. The Center frequently hosts other teachers' center staff, policy boards, and teachers. The Teaching Learning Center has also been the focus of attention for staff development administrators and researchers from around the country who are seeking new ways of meeting teachers' professional needs through teachers' centers and other innovative staff development programs.

As the Teaching Learning Center has evolved in its programs and resources over the past five years, it is apparent that, like students and teachers, it has gone through different stages of development. While the Center initially focused on materials, concrete resources, displays and generally encouraged teacher use and involvement, presently in addition to these resources the Center focuses on other dimensions that seem to deepen the quality of our programs. Recent programs include increased networking

among teachers and participants of the center, a study group on the stages of teacher development open to teachers, coordinating teachers and principals, special support programs (for Intermediate Teachers and for New Teachers), encouraging increased secondary teacher use and involvement. The Advisory has initiated and has helped implement Area Orientation Dinners for teams of principals, CTs, and classroom teachers from each school within each of the eight areas. These sessions include an overview of the TLC's philosophy, programs and resources as well as an assessment and discussion of specific area interests to which the Center can respond. In an effort to increase principals' awareness and involvement in the center, plans for future programs in the Teaching Learning Center continue to emerge from ideas generated by teachers, coordinating teachers and the Advisory.

The Coordinating Teacher's Role

In the spring of 1979, the Charlotte-Mecklenburg School System created a new position in the school: that of coordinating teacher. The primary purpose of this position was to assure that each school building would have at least one person whose role would be designed to provide direct meaningful support to classroom teachers in pursuing individual interests and in dealing with curriculum and instructional needs. CT support comes in a variety of fashions, e.g. providing individual consultation in classrooms, observation and analysis of classroom environments, coordination of school activities, the design and conduct of building level inservice activity, and linkage to support personnel and programs outside of the local school building.

In order to assure that the persons who occupy these positions would not be perceived as superordinates to the teachers or another layer in the administrative hierarchy, a number of steps were taken:

1. The role was carefully defined in a way that totally excluded coordinating

teachers from the formative evaluations of teachers. Both principals and coordinating teachers were carefully instructed regarding this matter.

2. A three-week comprehensive staff development effort for all people coming into the new role of coordinating teacher was carried out. The main purposes of this effort were to:
   a) define the boundaries of the role, particularly in establishing that coordinating teachers would not have administrative responsibilities;
   b) provide an overview of the K-12 curriculum and an orientation to all system-wide material resources and human support services. (Teams of principals and coordinating teachers attended this portion of the program together.)
3. Top level administrators have monitored the performance of coordinating teachers to insure that they do not become entrapped in administrative roles or unintentially take on evaluative roles.
4. Coordinating teachers are directly housed in local building units and care was taken to assure that they did not, among themselves, develop an in-group solidarity which might set them apart from the teachers. While they do meet for school-related purposes within their areas, they have generally been precluded from meeting with each other in ways which would lead them to assume that coordinating teachers represent an organizational entity.
5. Coordinating teachers continue to be on the teacher's salary scale and continue to be employed on the same ten-month contract as classroom teachers, although they are relieved of classroom duties for the time of their appointment

At present, each secondary school in CMS has a coordinating teacher assigned on a full-time basis. Of the 74 elementary schools, 34 schools have full-time coordinating teachers, whereas 40 smaller schools are paired in sharing a coordinating teacher. There

re also eight area coordinating teachers who work with the eight Area Superintendents and provide support and coordination for the school CTs within each area. Apparently, the role of coordinating teacher is perceived as useful, given:

1. The continuation of the position of coordinating teacher was in the top 10% of the budget priorities set by the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools and unanimously approved by the School Board.
2. In addition, ten senior high coordinating teachers' positions were added for the 1980-81 school year.

Certainly, it seems that the position of the coordinating teacher is potentially one of the most vital formal and informal links between the Teaching Learning Center and classroom teachers.

Data Analysis and Findings

1. How do coordinating teachers use the TLC to support their work with teachers in building level units?

The TLC usage study enabled us to rank order the ways in which the CTs used the TLC. However, the central question of any such rank ordering is "as compared to what?". In other words, the meaning of any pattern of usage is best indicated by comparing CT usage of the TLC with some other group of users. Since the TLC is designed primarily to assist teachers, it seemed that we would better understand how CTs use the TLC to support their work with teachers if we compared the CT usage of the TLC to the teacher usage.

In Table 1 (which is at the end of the discussion of this research question), we have the rank orderings of twelve types of usage for each group. The data reveal two important things. First, CTs tend to be more "in search" than the teachers . Repeated teacher usage is heavily concentrated in laminating, recycling, and browsing but repeated CT usage is found in more varied types of usage. Further, teachers seemingly go primarily to laminate instructional materials while CTs go much less often to laminate (although they do considerable laminating for their teachers) but more often to preview materials, to browse, to use recycled materials, and to develop curriculum. It seems, then, that the TLC usage study suggests that CTs respond to many different teachers with many different needs and are constantly in search of resources in this work with and support of teachers. The TLC seems to be a place that satisfies these various needs at least to some extent since CT usage is diverse and less concentrated in a single resource.

The survey data provide yet another depiction of how CTs use the TLC to support their work. The rank-order of four purposes for using the TLC staff and resources (rank-orders were the same for both the staff and resources) was: (1) teacher development; (2) self-renewal; (3) assigned duties; and (4) to establish credibility. As could be

xpected, then, the CTs see the TLC primarily as a place to assist them with teacher development. The second rank assigned to self-renewal suggests that the TLC, however, also is a place they go to improve their own knowledge and/or to get emotional support for a complex and demanding role. This seems to contradict the data from the usage study in which emotional support ranked at the bottom. It may be that emotional support is an important service but that CTs rarely go to the TLC primarily for that purpose; rather it is coupled with another service. The CTs go to search but that search entails both knowledge (which is itself renewing) and emotional support which is ancillary to seeking ideas and materials. Or, it could be that the survey data indicates that the most significant self-renewal for CTs comes in the form of ideas and materials and less as emotional support.

The ranking of assigned duties as third and establishing credibility as fourth should be carefully interpreted. Neither seems to be a very important purpose for ing to the TLC. CTs go to the TLC because it is a helpful resource for their work, not because they are told to or because they must for teachers to believe they are sincere in their efforts, however at times teacher requests may influence CTs' use of the TLC.

The survey asked CTs to indicate how they use the TLC in other ways also. The CTs were asked if they saw the TLC as important for ideas, materials, professional development and emotional support. In general, the TLC staff was seen as important for materials and ideas, respectively. Professional development was clearly ranked third and emotional support seemed not very important. When assessing TLC resources, the pattern was the same with professional development being more important than it was when considering the TLC staff. Again it seems that knowledge is the issue. The TLC provides materials and ideas, and the resources themselves are somewhat more relevant than the staff to professional development, as the CTs see it.

The final way the survey data help us to understand how CTs use the TLC is by establishing the nature of the contact with the TLC. The CTs can either go directly,

call on the telephone, or refer the teachers themselves. The total number of combin contacts with the TLC for going, calling and referring is high. Fully 77% of the CTs indica ted they had five or more contacts with the TLC in a typical month, with 44% indicating nine or more contacts in a typical month. Of these contacts, 58% went to the TLC themselves twice or more per month; 53% called two or more times; and 55% referred a teacher twice or more per month. When looking at four or more contacts in each category, the distributions reveal some differences between the three types of contact. Only 12% of the CTs went to the TLC more than four times a month, while 18% called more than four times. Teachers, however, were referred to the TLC more than four times by 44% of the CTs. In sum, then , CTs have regular contact with the TLC and referring of teachers happens more often in a typical month than either the CT going to or calling the TLC. We do not, however, know if CT referrals result in the teachers actually using the TLC resources. Therefore, this incidence of referral may not truly indicate actual contact but only attempted contact with the TLC.

The interview data enable us to better understand the salience of the TLC to the school coordinating teacher. The interviews similarly suggest that CTs use the TLC for materials, ideas and professional development, and seem to confirm that the support the TLC gives is professional and job-related. The CTs who were interviewed seemed to see the TLC as a way to give definition to their roles. In fact, it is vital that there has been an impetus on the part of some CTs to establish "mini-TLCs" in their school buildings. Upon request, the TLC has assisted these efforts to establish mini-TLCs by cooperatively planning with the CT, putting the CT in touch with other people who have tried this approach, and assisting the CT in locating and acquiring materials. Further, the significance of the TLC can be seen in some other quotes from the interview notes:

> The TLC and the Staff Development Center are extensions of what a CT can offer.

> When I'm in the building I'll always stick my head in to see what's new and available and I might get some things.....

Yet it is important to remember that the TLC is not the only resource system of importance to the CT in fulfilling her/his role. As one CT put it:

> When I need them they are invaluable. But sometimes you need them and sometimes you don't.

CTs perceive the need for their principal's guidance, confidence, and authority. Seemingly, the resource system the principal represents is essential to successful accomplishment of the advisor role. The area coordinating teacher provides another valuable resource system, as do the building faculty and curriculum specialists. Obviously, the TLC is only one of many resources for materials and knowledge in the system. In CMS, the media specialists, curriculum research library, the area superintendents, and the inservice team at the Staff Development Center, all provide ideas and materials.

The interviews seem to confirm the usage and survey data as to how the TLC is used. The TLC provides materials and ideas to the CTs:

> If I'm missing a piece of materials or I want some advice on how to handle a particular thing, they're available to me.

The TLC also locates information and materials, helps with curriculum development, and workshop planning.

> It is a good support for people. If you're here taking a course and, say, you have a project to do for the course, it's a great resource.

The interviews also indicate the TLC is able to "put people together", to "broker" other services for the CT that are not within the TLC's resource capability.

The interview transcripts and the subsequent analysis sessions gave particular salience to the role of the TLC in the professional development of the CT in contrast to the survey data. It may be that much of what the TLC does to promote

professional development, it accomplishes through professional "socialization" via discussions and problem-solving sessions rather than through explicit instruction or direction. Thus, the provision of ideas and materials by the TLC accomplishes its role enhancement functions in the process of providing more concrete resources. It was obvious to the CTs, though more implied than directly stated, that the TLC helps in developing the advising aspect of the CT role.

The interviews also clarify another issue raised by the usage and survey data. There it seemed that emotional support for the CT from the TLC is job-related as well as psychological.

> The support that they give you....I think this is the biggest thing that they give you.
>
> It gives me ideas so when teachers come to me I can say I have a unit on this.
>
> I can go in and shut the door and say I need to talk with you (the TLC) for a few minutes. It's nice to have that. I think we have confidentiality and understanding and it's probably needed more (often).
>
> To get me over the hurdle of frustration that I'm having.

The TLC's existence supports CTs by providing resources and ideas that help them to do their job:

> A lot of times I'll go over there with a list. What can I get to help with this, that or the other.
>
> They take time to sit down and talk to me about things....such as a workshop.
>
> I get things for the teachers,...they need the things for the kids and I'm coming anyway.
>
> They expect me to go and bring it (materials) back to them ... and I guess I spoil them by doing that.
>
> If I think the teacher will benefit I send them. If I think it's something I can take care of myself then I do it or have it sent through courier.
>
> I would come down and they would give me materials. As a matter of fact they helped me to set it up (a mini-TLC in the school) because they (the TLC) saw the idea as being good and said our things are going out there to be used.

In sum, the CT uses the TLC for materials and ideas but also gets a welcomed dose of professional socialization in the process. This socialization is mostly focused on the advisor dimensions of the role and it seems that the materials, ideas, and socialization are essential professional and emotional supports for a role as complex as that of a CT. The TLC further ably provides a vent for the frustration that this complex role creates.

TABLE 1

Rank-Orderings of Types of TLC Usage (One or More Times) for CTs and Teachers

Coordinating Teachers	Teachers
Preview materials (55% usage)	Laminating (64% usage)
Browsing (49%)	Recycling (33%)
Recycling (45%)	Browsing (30%)
Curriculum Development (45%)	Preview Materials (15%)
Laminating (41%)	Order Materials (14%)
Bookstore (28%)	Materials Production (13%)
Order Materials (28%)	Curriculum Development (12%)
Materials Production (21%)	Bookstore (10%)
Scheduled Session (17%)	Workshop Planning (5%)
Individual Conference (14%)	Scheduled Session (4%)
Workshop Planning (10%)	Emotional Support (3%)
Emotional Support (10%)	Individual Conference (1%)

2. To what extent does variability in the coordinating teachers' patterns of use of the resources of the TLC seem to affect or seem affected by the patterns of use by the teachers in their local building?, and

5. How do coordinating teachers' perceptions of their own roles in the local school building affect the ways in which they use the resources of the TLC?

Since our data indicated that variation in CTs' patterns of use was affected by both the context within which they worked and by the CTs' perception of the CT role, and that both context and role were related to teacher usage of the TLC as well as to CT usage we decided it was appropriate to analyze the data to respond to research questions two and five, simultaneously.

The interview data revealed that CTs' use of the TLC and teachers' use of the TLC were limited by several contextual factors: principal support, teaching orientation of the faculty, and teacher motivation. In some ways, each of these contextual factors is simply the competing definitions that others have of what needs to be done and how the CT should do it. These competing definitions further seemed to have some pattern that was related to both teacher and CT usage of the TLC.

Virtually every CT argued that support of the principal was absolutely necessary if the CT was to be effective. This "principal support" factor is relatively common in the planned change literature (Herriott and Gross, 1979), however, it commonly lacks substantive definition. The interview data suggest some dimensions of this factor. Certainly, since the principal selects the CT for the position there is both an implicit and an explicit recognition of legitimacy of the CT's efforts:

> It's clear that the principal made the choice (of me as CT) so I'm more or less a mirror reflection of his priorities.
>
> I go around and, believe it or not, I try to get to every classroom in the morning just to let them know I'm still there and whatever you want me to do I'm ready to do. And I always

> check with the principal and let him know that I'm there and see if there is anything that we need to touch base on.
>
> Of course, the principal is a daily, daily contact. I know last year we tried to sit down at least 10 or 15 minutes each day during the day and touch base. This year that's very back and forth at this point. We can almost read each other's minds to know if we need to touch base or not, so we haven't had to meet like we did last year.
>
> I think I know the things that he (the principal) expects of me and I try to do those things the very best and from that point on I'm able to work better with the teacher because I have identified with the principal and I know what he wants and what he expects.
>
> (My principal) is the kind of person who can listen and will accept new ideas and he is always supportive. He made the statement: "If you're going to make a decision, make it and we'll talk about it later."
>
> Make sure you understand what the principal wants because, after all, you may work directly under the principal and really not directly under the teachers.

As these quotes indicate, the support of the school principal is important to provide legitimacy and direction for the CT's actions. However, it is important to note that the quotes indicate that the principal's support of the CT is generally more legitimating than providing direction, which is consistent with Montgomery et al. (1981). In some schools, it was apparent that the principal decided to differentiate functions, thereby yielding the responsibility of curriculum over to the CT, leaving the principal free to concentrate on other issues.

Some may wish to believe that if the principal merely provides legitimacy for the CT's role, that the principal is actually doing little. This is certainly not the case. Teacher improvement and the development and implementation of curriculum oft require the commitment of teachers rather than the control of teachers. In such cases, the principal's evaluative role and the control it implies may thwart the development of approaches that have the commitments of the teaching staff. The CT can play a middle ro prompting efforts on the teachers' terms. In fact, the CT role was consciously

designed to fill this middle ground. For example, CTs were not to perform evaluation functions even though they were to work with teachers to improve their instruction:

> As far as getting into classrooms -- that has been the one thing that the principal has told me he did not want me to do in any way: for me to be evaluative.
>
> My principal is supportive, but I'm the one that goes.

Meyer and Rowan (1978) argue that in schools legitimation and production functions have been differentiated with administrators focusing more on legitimation and teachers and support staff focusing more on production. Their analysis seems to fit the case here. Legitimation is vitally necessary to the CT being able to promote TLC usage. Without it, the CT's efforts are largely in vain:

> I have never heard him (the principal) mention the TLC in a staff meeting or to a teacher.
>
> I don't think there was much support (from the principal). That reinforced their not having to go.

Aside from the support of the principal, teaching orientation of the faculty and teacher motivation were both revealed in the interview data as important context factors. Teaching orientations of faculty obviously affect the definition of the appropriate services which a CT should render. The interview data revealed that elementary and secondary schools had very different patterns of use, due to differences in teaching orientations. Much as Metz (1978) has suggested, secondary school teachers tend to be subject matter centered and emphasize student mastery of the subject as their primary goals. Elementary school teachers tend to be more child centered and "developmental", believing that reaching the child at his/her stage of development is the primary goal. The secondary teachers are less likely to emphasize the importance of teaching methods than are the elementary teachers and thus are less likely to find the TLC's resources as salient to their task:

> It is very strong for elementary and just not serviceable to secondary.
>
> I can't imagine that they would think there could possibly

> be anything for the senior high.
>
> Some secondary CTs use it mainly in response to a teacher request for something specific at the (TLC) center.
>
> I think in our (secondary) school they feel that it is designed to help the elementary students more. I'm sorry to say that some of our teachers if I would ask them to use the TLC they would ask me, "What is it?"

Obviously, teaching orientation leads to relative motivation to use the TLC. However, there are other aspects of teacher motivation that need to be discussed. The interview data suggested two salient factors: distance and interest in teacher improvement. Distance factor is clearly a motivational factor. That is to say, perceived distance is relative to perceived interest in and worth of what is to be gained from the trip (Schlechty, 1981), particularly in CMS. However, distance seems to be less of an inhibiting factor for those teachers who are concerned about improving their skills:

> I told you about bringing the new teachers..The(TLC staff) go through the TLC and show you everything.
>
> Teachers use the TLC if they're already at the SDC for other purposes.
>
> The main people at our school that use it (the TLC) are the young energetic teachers.
>
> Most of the teachers I see using the TLC are information seekers. Those people that are most likely to stop me in the halls and ask questions. Those teachers are very interested in dealing with children. They probably get to the TLC without ... referring them.

The interviews revealed that the TLC was used more by teachers who were new, changing grades, reassessing their teaching approach, and/or were engaged in other staff development activities.

Aside from suggesting that TLC usage is affected by such contextual factors as principa support, teaching orientation of faculty and teacher motivation, the interview data also point to the many ways CTs promote usage. CTs go directly to the TLC to pick up resources for the teachers, refer teachers to get their own resources, and someti

even view the former as a vehicle to gain credibility and thus to promote the latter:

> I promote the TLC in my school by the materials I have. They say where do you get it and I tell them "the TLC". I will encourage some (teachers) to do things at the SDC.
>
> I think they (the teachers) would tend to come to me instead of going directly to the TLC, where I would know to go directly to the TLC for something like that. I think most teachers would come around this way first.
>
> First year as a CT, I had a lot of very specific things (to get for teachers). My second year I look at it as the job is to help them learn for themselves.
>
> I would get materials and take them back from the TLC -- see what's new in there and let them know. But then there were only 2 or 3 teachers who used it. I said, "maybe if I don't bring anything back that I told them was down there, they would come down and get it." So I started playing games to get them to go.

Yet context affects efforts on the part of the CT to use the TLC to gain credibility. In some schools, teachers seemed to resent the "freedom" of the CT to be away from school, even if it was spent at the TLC getting materials for teachers.

Aside from context, the CT's perception of her/his role affects both CT and teacher usage patterns. The CTs who use materials as a means to establish credibility see the role differently from those who view materials as the final outcome. As one CT of the latter category put it:

> I hope the reason they are not coming (to the TLC) is because I'm doing my job by staying in touch and bringing it to them.

This distinction, however, is not the vital one according to the interview data. The primary role perception difference concerned the CT viewing the role (and/or others viewing it) primarily to be that of an <u>advisor</u> to teachers, helping them improve instruction on their own terms, or as a <u>manager</u>, coordinating curriculum, schedules, student placements, etc.. Further, it appears that this role perception

is affected by teacher orientation within the schools. Elementary school CTs tend to be more oriented toward advising while secondary school CTs are more oriented toward coordinating instruction with department heads. Junior high schools seem to have either orientation, or both may coexist. As we have already noted, the TLC's philosophy and approach are consistent with an advisor orientation and less supportive of the managerial orientation.

The advisor aspect of the CT's role puts emphasis on working with teachers on their own terms to improve instruction:

> There have been times I've gone in, even for something simple and they say, "You ought to stay for a while." And they do involve me in that way.
>
> Basically, I had to work to gain credibility from the teachers. And what I did (was) I remembered how the CT at (another) school had been (supportive) for me and that is, she won me over by showing that she was worth her weight....She was very available and approachable so I remembered that and tried to establish that sort of relationship with the teachers.
>
> I don't think I ever turned a teacher down to do something.
>
> I would get them some materials but I wouldn't do the work for them. It was interesting. It was a very delicate sort of position.
>
> They (teachers) know I like to come in and work (in classrooms) and I'm still teacher-student oriented. Before I give them anything new I like to try it out. I like to always see that they are comfortable in doing it.
>
> At first, I think one of the main things I did, and I had to really plant my feet pretty hard to do it, was I did not push myself on them. I let them come to me and it paid off.
>
> I was not a threat to them. I was not going to come in and try to use authority or power over them. I was nobody that had stepped up above them.

By contrast, managerial responsibilities tend to portray the role quite dissimilarly:

> I carry other responsibilities just like the teachers do. I

have breakfast duty, bus duty -- I have the whole bit.

One thing that was really good for me personally this year as a CT -- I got to learn quite a bit about the system and who is in charge of this and who can I get this information from....

In other words, things came down to do that he (the principal) didn't have time to do or he felt like I could handle.

I go through the grade chairmen. Then it doesn't look like you're showing favorites.

I do not work with teachers too much in how they present materials in the classroom, I try to provide resources in the way of materials, but how they use it, I don't work on that.

I don't get into the classroom enough to work with the children . That concerns me, but I don't have the time.

A very strong seasonality exists, you get into testing season, at the beginning of the year there is placement season....

I do a lot of coordinating in the junior high....coordinating with departments as far as curriculum goes.

It's important to keep a certain distance when you work in the CT role, because even though you're a teacher, just like other teachers, they see you in a different light.

Lack of authority is a limiting factor.

So much paperwork....

The advisor and managerial components to the role seem differentially emphasized by different CTs and in different contexts. For this reason, it is inappropriate to classify a CT as advisor or manager in orientation. It is more likely that all CTs have both components to their role and are called upon to fulfill both, even though they are at times contradictory.

In short, the interview data suggest that variations in patterns of CT use of the TLC does affect teacher usage and that CT role perceptions affect both CT and teacher usage. The interview data also suggest that there are some ways to increase

usage regardless of context or role perception. In general, it seems that usage is its own best advertisement, thus efforts to increase initial use would seem to be the best method to "multiply" usage via the CTs:

> If you take the same workshops the teacher takes and ride down there together, they have to be with you and you go in yourself to the TLC....It's new exposure and they find it doesn't hurt to go down there....You have to expose them and get teachers to talk about how good it is.
>
> Teachers will jump on something much more quickly if they hear another teacher say that they've gotten good things there.
>
> I've had a couple of teachers come to me and say "wow, have you been in the TLC?" -- and I've been talling them for two years! They have to see it to believe it.

Certainly not all coordinating teachers use the TLC to the same extent and it might be expected that this pattern of usage seems to affect teacher usage of the TLC.The interviews of CTs in two areas suggested variations in the context and role perceptions of the CTs that seemed related to their usage and to the ways they perceived teachers in their schools using the TLC. Some of these differences can be tapped using the survey data. First, it seemed that CTs varied in how directly or indirectly they tapped the TLC's resources (go, call, refer). Second, it was apparent that secondary CTs saw the TLC as less relevant to their teachers and their teachers seemed to concur. However, some junior high schools seemed to use the TLC more similarly to elementary schools than secondary schools. This suggests even within the context of the more bureaucratic secondary school organization, the CT could take on a managerial function by working through committees and department heads or could function more in terms of an advisor by working with the teacher in the classroom. Third, it seemed that the CT role varied along dimensions of who initiated their classroom advising work. The survey was designed to tap all these dimensions.

A note of caution, however, is in order. The interviews did not clearly indicate that these categories were all distinct context and role orientations. Rather the interviews

suggested that these dimensions were interrelated. Our indicators should not be interpreted as distinct categories of CTs. CTs have to balance a complex set of role responsibilities and work in various contexts. Our indicators tap only some dimensions of the complexity of role and context.

One dimension on which CTs seemed to vary was simply their perceived frequency of use of the TLC. In Table II, we see that CTs who perceive themselves to be frequent users of the TLC Resources are much more likely to perceive that their faculties frequently use the TLC resources (58 percent compared with 12 percent) and staff (30 percent compared with 3 percent). However, it should be noted that the number of cases in the infrequent CT usage of resources cells are small and therefore may not be reliable. Frequent CT usage of the TLC staff is related to their perceptions of their faculties' usage of the TLC resources or staff. In all, then, it would seem that CT usage of resources encourages the teachers to use the TLC resources and staff. When the CT brings back materials and says "they are from the TLC", the teachers get the message and use the TLC resources and, perhaps in order to facilitate access to the resources, also use the TLC staff more frequently, at least as CTs perceive it. The lack of relationship of CT usage of TLC staff to perceived teacher usage of either TLC resources or staff is interesting. It may suggest that when CTs use the TLC staff, it is to solve a CT's problem. That is, CTs who are frequent users of the TLC staff may be developing a set of skills and resources that reinforce the CT as a teacher resource potentially replacing teacher use of the TLC. Therefore, no relationship would be expected.

Aside from frequency of use, CT usage can be either direct or indirect. We operationalized this as whether they tend to "go" to the TLC, "call" the TLC, or "refer" their teachers to the TLC. In Table III, the data reveal some interesting patterns. It should be noted that CT usage was measured as those who "go, call, or refer" frequently (40 percent or more of the total 100% of going, calling and referring).

The proportions of frequent teacher usage are uniformly high, with no other distinct patterns. Thus it seems that type of contact (i.e. going, calling, referring) is not as important as the fact of contact in affecting teacher usage, at least as CTs perceive both.

The interviews found that elementary and secondary schools varied in their overall patterns of usage. In Table IV, we can see that the type of school does affect perceptions of how frequently teachers use both the TLC resources and staff. In the elementary schools, the CTs perceive 41 percent of their teachers as having frequent usage of TLC resources, while in secondary schools the CTs perceive only 29 percent of their teachers having frequent usage of TLC resources. A similar pattern exists concerning teacher usage of the TLC staff, however, in general, CTs do not perceive a high percentage of their teachers as having frequent usage of the TLC staff.

Since we have already noted that CT usage seems to be different from that of teachers and that for resources, at least, they are related, it could be that type of school affects CT usage as well as teacher usage. In Table IV, the data reveal that this is so. Elementary schools are more likely than secondary schools to have CTs who perceive themselves as frequent users of <u>both</u> the resources and staff of the TLC. In sum, type of school affects both perceived teacher usage and CT usage of <u>both</u> TLC resources and staff.

Another way CT usage seemed to vary according to the interviews, concerned whether the CT saw his/her role more as a manager, in terms of working with organizational mechanisms of the schools or more as an advisor and working on direct classroom concerns. Obviously, these dimensions are difficult to totally separate. However, we reasoned the former, a more managerial orientation, to be more administrative in tone. We measured this in terms of whether career interests were in administrative lines or in staff development/curriculum lines. Admittedly, this is a poor measure but no other data were complete enough to provide

different measure. The latter or more advisory orientation, we measured in terms of the frequency of the CT working with teachers in classrooms while students were present. Those who indicated they did this three or more times per week we classified as high advisor-oriented while less than three times per week indicated low advisor orientation.

In Table V, we see that a more managerial orientation has a lower percent of frequent CT usage of both TLC staff and resources than does the advisor orientation. Teacher usage of the TLC is consistently higher for the advisor oriented but does not attain the 10% difference criteria of significance. The managerial oriented seem to use the TLC less frequently and perceive that their teachers also use the TLC less frequently. However, the number of CTs who are managerially oriented is so small that we should have little faith in these results. A better measure of managerial orientation seemingly is needed.

It seems that our measure of advising is more direct and revealed more consistent and reliable patterns of data. We see in Table VI that high advisor-oriented CTs both perceive themselves and their faculties to be more frequent users of TLC resources and staff. Thus it does seem that the TLC is important to a particular role definition on the part of CTs. The more advising, and possibly less managerial, CT uses both the TLC resources and staff frequently and so do their faculty. Of course, it could be that in schools where teachers are heavy TLC users, the CT has little option but to take on an advisor orientation, but this seems less plausible than advising CTs leading to teacher usage interpretation.

The last role orientation variable that the interviews suggested may be important concerned who initiates contact with teachers. While certainly the motivation for the initiating contact with teachers can vary regardless of who initiated it, the interviews suggested that some CTs saw their job as being available to teachers and at least initially as accepting of the teachers definition of the need or problem.

This seems to be consistent with an advising approach. Other CTs, possibly those with a more managerial approach, used some degree of influence over the teacher and thus would primarily initiate contacts with the teachers themselves. Finally, the interviews suggested that some CTs contacted teachers as the result of the initiation of others (the principal, guidance counselor, etc.). In Table VII, data on the effects of type of initiation on frequency of teacher and CT usage of TLC staff and resources are displayed. Consistently, CTs who perceived initiation of contact to come from the teachers are quite likely to perceive a high frequency of faculty usage of both the TLC resources and staff, again confirming the saliency of the TLC to the advisor dimension of the CT role. Those CTs who saw themselves as the initiators of contacts with teachers were less likely to perceive their faculties to be frequent users of the TLC, again seeming consistent with the managerial dimension of the CR role. Finally, the few number of cases of other initiated does not allow any conclusions.

Somewhat similar patterns are found when looking at CT usage of TLC staff and resources also. High teacher initiation seems to prompt more frequent CT usage of TLC resources but not more frequent CT usage of TLC staff, suggesting that teachers are prompting CTs to get material resources more often than prompting them to use TLC staff. Those with high CT initiation of teacher contacts seems to need less of both the TLC resources and staff, suggesting that the intervention is of a different order. Finally, the small n again makes the effects of initiation not amenable to interpretation.

In summary, the responses to research questions 2 and 5 thus seem rather direct, even though the details may seem rather complex. It seems that variations in school context and variations in CT role perceptions have systematic effects on both teacher and CT usage of the TLC. Major school context factors or issues concern nature of principal support, teaching orientation of faculty, and teacher motivation. The major role perception variables affected the relative weight of the managerial and advis dimensions of the CT role. An emphasis on an advisor orientation supports more TLC usage.

TABLE II

CT Usage of TLC Staff and Resources by Teacher Use of TLC Staff and Resources

	CT Use of TLC:			
	Resources		Staff	
	Frequent	Infrequent	Frequent	Infrequent
Percent of Frequent Teacher Usage of TLC Resources	58% (23)	12% (4)	19% (14)	28% (13)
Percent of Frequent Teacher Usage of TLC Staff	30% (12)	3% (1)	11% (8)	7% (5)

TABLE III

Type of TLC Contact by CT by Frequency of Teacher Usage of Resources and Staff

	CT frequently		
	Goes	Calls	Refers
Percentage Frequent Teacher Usage of TLC Resources	67% (26)	82% (31)	76% (28)
Percentage Frequent Teacher Usage of TLC Staff	75% (9)	75% (9)	91% (10)

TABLE IV

Type of School by Frequency of Teacher and CT Usage of TLC Resources and Staff

	Type of School	
	Elementary	Secondary
Percent Frequent Teacher Usage of TLC Resources	41% (20)	29% (7)
Percent Frequent Teacher Usage of TLC Staff	22% (11)	8% (2)
Percent Frequent CT Usage of TLC Resources	63% (31)	38% (9)
Percent Frequent CT Usage of TLC Staff	52% (25)	25% (6)

TABLE V

CT Orientation by Frequency of Teacher and CT Usage of TLC Resources and Staff

	CT Orientation	
	Managerial	Advisor
Percent Frequent Teacher Usage of TLC Resources	31% (4)	37% (21)
Percent Frequent Teacher Usage of TLC Staff	8% (1)	18% (10)
Percent Frequent CT Usage of TLC Resources	46% (6)	56% (32)
Percent Frequent CT Usage of TLC Staff	33% (4)	46% (26)

TABLE VI

Degree of Advisor Orientation by Teacher and CT Usage of TLC Resources and Staff

	Degree of Advisor Orientation	
	High	Low
Percent Frequent Teacher Usage of TLC Resources	48% (17)	28% (8)
Percent Frequent Teacher Usage of TLC Staff	26% (9)	10% (3)
Percent Frequent CT Usage of TLC Resources	60% (21)	45% (14)
Percent Frequent CT Usage of TLC Staff	44% (15)	38% (11)

TABLE VII

Source of Initiation by Teacher and CT

Usage of TLC Resources and Staff

	Source of Initiation		
	Teacher	CT	Other
Percent Frequent Teacher Usage of TLC Resources	63% (17)	15% (4)	5% (1)
Percent Frequent Teacher Usage of TLC Staff	69% (9)	18% (2)	10% (1)
Percent Frequent CT Usage of TLC Resources	64% (25)	41% (16)	3% (1)
Percent Frequent CT Usage of TLC Staff	60% (19)	18% (5)	4% (1)

3. How much variability is there in the knowledge coordinating teachers have regarding the resources and programs available from the TLC and how does this variability affect patterns of use?

The TLC makes regular attempts to advertise its services. Each issue of the Staff Development Newsletter distributed to the entire CMS staff contains a full page of TLC programs, activities, and/or recently acquired resources. Further, the TLC has instituted a series of "area dinners" where the area superintendent, area CT, principals and school CTs meet in the TLC for a tour, dinner, and a presentation concerning the resources available in the TLC and ways in which the TLC may respond to specific area needs and interests. Thus far, the TLC has conducted six of the eight area dinners. The staff responds to requests to come to school staff meetings and at times conduct staff development workshops to respond to school, area and system-wide needs. The TLC and its staff, in short, make considerable effort to publicize their services, especially since they must staff the TLC for 53 hours per week, and overlap staff hours to adequately cover peak usage periods. Nevertheless, it does not seem that the TLC resources are communicated as widely as the TLC staff would like.

In relation to this issue, the CTs, it seems, do have some variance in their knowledge of the TLC. However, it is apparent from the interviews that lack of knowledge is not primarily a problem of lack of specific information. Rather it seems that lack of knowledge of TLC resources and programs interacts with a host of factors, most important of which are role perception and school context. We have discussed earlier how various role perceptions affect TLC usage and will not duplicate that discussion here. However, the interviews seem to indicate that lack of knowledge of the TLC interacted primarily with other factors that inhibited use. Generally, elementary school CTs, CTs with actively supportive principals and/or advisor-oriented CTs have more knowledge than do CTs in secondary schools, CTs without actively supportive principals, and/or CTs who are managerial in orientation. The latter have little reason to use the TLC for their teachers and principals who view the TLC as less appropriate

to their needs. Without some role- or context-related motivation, it is doubtful that even CTs who went to the TLC would significantly increase their knowledge -- it is simply not in their interests to do so.

The CTs with some role or context motivation to use the TLC are more knowledgeable but even among the more knowledgeable CTs there seems to be categories of knowledge. In one category, some CTs have knowledge of only the resources their teachers indicate interest in or specifically request. They, then, see the TLC as a resource primarily for teachers. The elementary school CTs at this level are knowledgeable primarily of the wide range of TLC materials, while similar secondary school CTs know about the TLC bookstore and specific resources such as maps, laminating machines, and materials directly related to secondary school curriculum.

Another category of knowledge of TLC resources includes perceiving it as a place for ideas, interaction and exchange, as well as for materials. For these CTs, the TLC serves them as well as their teachers. As we have discussed earlier, the TLC and the advis[redacted] CTs seem to share a similar approach and ideology. For these CTs, the TLC is a place to get ideas, to develop curriculum and to discuss strategies for teacher development. A third category of knowledge of TLC resources also seems to exist. CTs with this perspective view the TLC as a place that provides resources for their own professional development. These CTs use the staff to "link people to people" via either "brokering" and/or "networking". The TLC staff also supports these CTs in planning staff development workshops, exploring the CT role, and in keeping abreast of recent developments in the field. For these CTs, using and being aware of TLC programs and resources are viewed as a vital part of this job. As one CT explained, "I would go in periodically just to check to see what's available." This updating often results in the CT making attempts to "tie them (materials, ideas, etc.) into curriculum in the school". These CTs even see a way to boost teacher morale through the exchange of ideas which are shared at the TLC.

The interviews with CTs from two areas, however, did reveal one interesting poi[redacted] of confusion. It seems that the history of staff development is intimately linked (through

staff, geographic proximity and ideology) to the history of the TLC and thus results in some confusion over where the TLC ends and the Staff Development Center, which houses the TLC as well as other services, begins. Many CTs use the acronym SDC when referring to TLC events and resources and vice versa. Some might wish to believe this is an important symbolic confusion and with some derogatory effect. However, this is not the case

It was difficult to directly test the CT's knowledge of TLC resources in the survey. However, we did ask the CTs to write in their purposes for going, calling or referring to the TLC. We coded these responses to indicate appropriate and inappropriate purposes for going, calling or referring to the TLC. In Table VIII, the results are displayed. To be consistent with the earlier analyses in this report, the effect of relative knowledge on teacher as well as CT usage is indicated. Note that CTs who confuse the SDC and the TLC and include SDC workshops, the curriculum research library, the inservice team, and the employee assistance program as part of the TLC, are more likely to be frequent users of the TLC resources and staff (although this difference minimally satisfies our criteria of significance) and further so are their teachers more frequent users. In shor it seems an active, involved CT has a full sense of the SDC's resources even though he/she makes some mistakes in identification. However, this minor confusion certainly does not distract from CT or teacher usage of the TLC and may even enhance it. Sometimes a little confusion is a good thing in that it encourages continued use and exploration of resources.

In summary, the knowledge a CT has of the TLC does seem to affect his/her usage of the TLC. However, knowledge is poorly conceived as only information. For role perceptions and school context seem to explain the variation in CT knowledge concerning TLC resources and programs. Further, there are categories of knowledge of the TLC resources that seem directly related to the ways the CTs use the TLC. However, it seems that a strict knowledge test is inappropriate. The survey results suggest that CTs who are high users of the TLC fail to make the same distinctions in program boundaries of would the TLC or SDC staff.

TABLE XIII

CT Knowledge of TLC Resources by CT Usage of TLC Resources and Staff

	Knowledge of TLC Resources	
	Knowledgeable	Not Knowledgeable
Percent Frequent Teacher Usage of TLC Resources	33% (17)	48% (10)
Percent Frequent Teacher Usage of TLC Staff	12% (6)	32% (7)
Percent Frequent CT Usage of TLC Resources	48% (25)	72% (15)
Percent Frequent CT Usage of TLC Staff	40% (21)	50% (10)

4. How do the coordinating teachers' perceptions of the types of support systems available to them, in addition to the TLC, affect their patterns of use of the TLC?

In addressing question three, we saw that CTs who were confused about where the TLC ends and the SDC begins perceived themselves and their teachers as more frequent users of the TLC resources and staff. This suggests that the SDC resources and the TLC are complementary and not in direct competition. However, the SDC is only one type of support system available to CTs. The CTs also rely on line personnel especially the principal, and other staff such as curriculum specialists and area CTs.

For the CT, knowledge of available resource in the CMS is essential. As the CTs put it:

> I just don't pretend (to know) but I've also had teachers say "you're supposed to know everything". I say, "no, I might not, but I'll try to find out for you". That's where the patience (required in the job) comes in.
>
> The need to know who to talk to...that's on the job training. You learn that as you go But I still don't know them all. My principal has been in this district a long time and usually gives me names.
>
> (For resources I go to) the curriculum specialists, Curriculum Research Library....They were very helpful down there. They would send out materials or they would help you when you would go in there....The TLC, to some extent...I really didn't get into that until, I'll say, about midyear. I started getting things from over there and they were very helpful -- very warm people. Let's see -- oh, the inservice people were very helpful.
>
> You are really the person. You have to have the knowledge and the drive to go to these people yourself....

Since the CT responds to requests from both the teacher and the principal, the most valuable resource he/she can have is knowledge of the various resources available in the system. The CT seeks resources where available, and often the most available and appropriate resources are within the school. Obviously, the principal is an essential support for the CT. Generally the support received seems to be more of the backing of someone with authority than someone who focuses on resolving instructional or curriculum

problems. In fact, it seems that presence of the CT role in some schools has led principals to differentiate functions -- assigning curriculum to the CT and stepping out of it themselves. Yet it is important to note that principals vary in how they work with the CT. Some work as teams, while some see a clear division of responsibility to be appropriate. Yet make no mistake -- without the legitimizing support of the principal there is very little a CT can do in a school.

> In the school it's the principal. If you have the principal's support; I think that's most important because if you have his support then usually you'll have the teachers' support in the school.
>
> We get a lot of support from our assistant principal in our school.
>
> My principal was very supportive. I guess....I'm not quite sure that he knew all I was doing.

Other school personnel were used for ideas and material resources more than for political and role definition support. Certainly the teachers themselves are valuable resources for some CTs:

> Very often I've (CT) gone to other teachers and just talked with them.
>
> First of all, I try within the school because we do have some excellent teachers and they are willing to share.

Some types of teachers seem to be of more use than others. Certainly the media specialist is uniquely valuable as are itinerant teachers, especially those in the fine arts. In secondary schools, there is another type of teacher that is of particular value: the department head. However, it seems that the department head is similar to the principal in that they are more legitimatizing than problem-solving. As one secondary school CT described it, whenever a teacher comes to her with a request, she "finds out if the teacher has discussed this with the department head."

A similar dichotomy between legitimatizing support and conceptual and material resources is helpful when discussing resources outside the school. The curriculum specialist seems to have different functions depending on the type of school the CT

serves. The curriculum specialists are more vital in the secondary schools than in the elementary, where they help the CTs with their workshops. Nevertheless, the curriculum specialists serve both clearance and legitimatizing functions as well as a sources for ideas.

> Of course, you have to draw from the specialists.
>
> I think if you want something clarified go to the specialists. I guess I would see them more for opinions than just helping me get resources.
>
> (After first going to the teachers) then I go to the curriculum specialists and I try to never bypass them.

One of the most valuable resources outside the school, however, is other coordinating teachers. This support comes in many forms but the most significant seems to be ideas and emotional support:

> ....as we meet the CTs draw from each other.
>
> My first call is to another CT. That's what I always do.
>
> We give each other a lot of moral support and talk about things that would work in her school and things that work in mine.

For material resources, the CTs seem to rely essentially on the TLC and the curriculum research library -- each providing different types of materials. In addition, however, the TLC provides for discussion of strategies to accomplish tasks and even a brokering function to other resources from the community (e.g. speakers, tours, recycled materials). The SDC provides inservice support as well. The TLC and SDC also provide role-related support:

> Even when I thought that maybe I knew the answer (I contacted the TLC or SDC) because sometimes it's good to hear someone else.... say the same thing.

In summary, the interview data suggest that CTs find that the various support systems provide different but equally necessary resources. The principal, assistant principal, and to some extent the curriculum specialists provide a legitimatizing function. The teachers, psychologists, TLC, SDC, curriculum specialists, area CTs and other

CTs serve as a source of ideas and as checkpoints for clarifications. For the CTs themselves, the TLC and the SDC provide emotional and role support. Finally, the curriculum research library and the TLC seem to provide the materials that are vital to a CT's support of teachers in enhancing their instruction.

The survey data enable another look at the various support systems available to the CTs. In the questionnaire, the CTs were asked to indicate what type of resource each support system provided for them. In Table IX a wide range of support systems were investigated enabling assessments for the attendance area, the school, the community and the central office (curriculum specialists, SDC, curriculum, research library, and TLC).

At the area level, the most valuable resources for the CT seems to be the area CT and other school CTs. It seems that the area and school CTs provide the full range of resources (ideas, materials, professional development and emotional support). The area superintendent, however, works primarily through the area CT and thus is not seen as a direct resource, as would be expected of an area superintendent role.

At the school level, however, the principal is viewed as more helpful than the area superintendent, and seems to provide essentially emotional support even though it is often combined with ideas and professional development. However, it is important to note that it seems that the principal provides less resources than other school personnel. These data may support the interview data suggestions that line authority is vital and can be granted only by administrative personnel.

The teachers and aides are by far the most important school level resources. Teachers seemingly represent a broad resource encompassing all four types (ideas, materials, professional development, and emotional support). The aides seemingly provide a low level of a more specialized resources -- primarily in the form of materials and, to a lesser extent, ideas. Other school staff and support staff seem not to be as valuable as the teachers but more so than aides. Given the diversity of staff included in these categories, it comes as no surprise that this support

system is seen as providing all the possible resources even though not often. The school media specialist provides a high level of idea and material resources, while the school counselor provides a much lower level of resources and primarily in the form of ideas and emotional support.

The support systems outside the CMS includes parents of students, community resources, the CT's family, professional conferences, and colleges and universities. Parents of students seem to be a little-utilized resource for CTs, but, when utilized, it seems ideas are the resources provided. The community seems to be a good source of ideas and materials which also may be seen as a source of professional development for the CT. The CT's family is the best source for emotional support and to a less extent ideas are sometimes coupled with the emotional support. Professional conferences are good sources of ideas, development and materials respectively, while colleges and universities are good sources for professional development, ideas and materials respectively. Given the line/staff distinction and decentralized structure of CMS, it may be inappropriate to refer to the curriculum specialists, the SDC, the curriculum research library, and the TLC as part of the central office. Rather it probably is better stated that these resources are centrally provided for the system as a whole. As a group, the CTs indicated that these resources were all of some importance. The curriculum specialists provided ideas, materials and professional development primarily, and in that order. Emotional support was also provided occasionally but essentially only when coupled with the other three resources. Apparently, the SDC and the training it provides is a good source of ideas, materials and professional development but in a pattern somewhat like that of the curriculum specialists it rarely provides emotional support and then essentially only when coupled with the other three types of resources. The curriculum research library also is a source of ideas, professional development and materials, in that order. This suggests that the curriculum research library is something the CTs use to enhance their own performance and

is used less to respond to teacher requests.

Finally, from the survey data, the TLC is viewed differentially when the material resources and staff resources are both assessed. The TLC resources and staff are seen as the third and fourth most valued resources respectively (area CT and other CTs are first and second, respectively). The TLC resources and TLC staff are best for ideas, materials and professional development, while the TLC staff also is somewhat of a source of emotional support but only when coupled with the other three. This again suggests that the emotional support provided by the TLC is primarily of a professional nature -- facilitating the CT's role definition and performance and thus emotional health.

In summary, it seems that CTs use virtually all support systems available to them and that some support systems provide similar types of resources. Nevertheless, these similarities do not seem to detract from TLC usage. After area CTs and other school CTs, the TLC is the next most valued resource and primarily for ideas, materials and professional development. Apparently, the TLC is sufficiently unique not to compete with other support systems but more likely complements what the others can provide.

TABLE IX

Type of Resource by Purpose of Usage

Purpose	Area Superintendent	Area CT	Other CT	Principal	Curriculum Specialists	Media Specialist	Guidance Counselor	Other School Support Staff	Other School Staff	Teachers	Aides	Curriculum Research Library	SDC Workshop	TLC Staff	TLC Resources	Professional Conference	College & University	Parents	Community Resources	Family
Not used	23	1	1	7	2	4	26	11	19	5	29	4	2	8	9	5	11	20	9	9
Ideas (I)	4		2	2	2		9	8	6	12	13		1	1	4	2	1	19	7	3
Materials (M)	2	11	1	2	1	15				1	3	4	1	5	6	1		1	7	
Professional Development (PD)	7		1	3			5	9	4	1	1	9	8	3	2	10	20	1	4	
Emotional Support (ES)	5	3	2	6			3	4	[illegible]		2		1					4	1	23
I & M	1	2	3	1	13	21	2	7		5	8	3	1	8	11	3	2	9	23	
M & PD	2		1		7	1						9	2	1	3					
PD & ES	11	3	1	6			2	3								3	2	2		2
M & ES	2	3				2	1		2	1										
I & PD	1	2	1	4	2	1	2	3	4	4	3	11	8		2	15	18	9	1	1
I & ES	3	1	4	3	1	1	11		3	5	3			1				5		16
I, M & PD	1	4	3	2	32	10	1	5	5	6	3	29	36	26	30	22	14	1	12	1
I, PD & ES	2	1	7	8			6	6	3	3				2		2	1			2
M, PD & ES	0	1		2				1							1					
I, M & ES	0	5	9	1		4	1	6	5	7	4							1	1	7
All four (I, M, PD, ES)	9	36	37	27	13	13	4	10	15	23	4	4	13	18	5	10	4	1	8	9

6. How does the coordinating teahcers' use of the TLC affect the assessments he/she makes of the Teaching Learning Center and to what extent are these assessments based upon direct experience?

As we have already discussed, the CT's usage of the TLC is affected by a number of role and context variables and also seems to vary in the focus of the contacts (categories of knowledge). Yet as we have noted, it seems that the TLC's best means of promotion is its usage. Apparently a teacher or CT who uses it once finds it to be a valuable resource. "They have to see it to believe it," as one CT explained. Yet it does seem also to be true that the TLC is generally well-regarded in CMS, though generally there are differing views between elementary and secondary school personnel.

The survey data enable us to examine how use affects assessments of the TLC for the CTs. In Table X, we see that CTs who report frequent TLC usage are more likely to assess both the TLC resources and staff as favorable and useful. While three of the eight column differences are less than our stated ten percent criteria for significant difference, all are in the same direction, yielding a convincing pattern of results. In any case it is important to note that regardless of use, CTs overwhelmingly see the TLC favorably and as being useful.

A measure of total TLC contact may mask the effects of discrete categories of usage (go, call, refer) on assessments of the TLC staff and resources. In Table XI, we see that CTs who directly "go" to the TLC frequently are more likely to assess the TLC resources and staff as "favorable" and are more likely to see both of them as being "useful", although favorable assessments seem less dependent on frequency of use. Infrequent users are also highly likely to view the TLC favorably. In short, the TLC's reputation is "favorable" enough to not depend on actual usage, while assessments of "usefulness" are more dependent on usage -- which would seem reasonable.

The CTs who use the TLC more indirectly, by "calling" it or by "referring" the teacher, reveal a similar pattern. (See Table XI.) It seems that in the cases of indirect usage, frequency of usage has less relationship to the favorability of

CTs toward the TLC, than the case with the direct usage of the TLC. Again, frequent usage and "useful" assessments are related.

We were able to add across the three types of direct and indirect contact to get another measure of frequency of usage. In Table XII, only two of the four column differences meet our criteria of significance and are in the direction that suggest a positive relationship between usage and assessment though both frequenct and infrequent users judge the TLC favorably and/or as useful.

In general, then, the survey data seems to confirm the interpretation from the interview data that the TLC is well-regarded. The TLC seems to be "favorably" perceived by CTs whether or not they use it frequently and, while the same is true when assessing "usefulness", frequent users are significantly more likely to find both the TLC staff and resources as useful than infrequent users.

TABLE X

TLC Usage of CTs by CT Assessments of TLC Resources and Staff

	Use of TLC Resources		Use of TLC Staff	
	Frequent	Infrequent	Frequent	Infrequent
"Favorable" Assessment of Resources	98% (39)	85% (28)	97% (30)	88% (36)
"Favorable" Assessment of Staff	95% (37)	91% (30)	97% (30)	90% (37)
"Useful" Assessment of Resources	98% (39)	73% (24)	97% (31)	78% (32)
"Useful" Assessment of Staff	95% (37)	82% (27)	97% (31)	83% (34)

TABLE XI

Direct and Indirect CT Usage by CT Assessments of TLC Resources and Staff

	CT Goes to the TLC	
	Frequently	Infrequently
"Favorable" Assessment of Resources	97% (35)	90% (27)
"Favorable" Assessment of Staff	97% (30)	93% (29)
"Useful" Assessment of Resources	97% (30)	83% (25)
"Useful" Assessment of Staff	97% (30)	90% (26)
	CT Calls the TLC	
	Frequently	Infrequently
"Favorable" Assessment of Resources	95% (37)	89% (17)
"Favorable" Assessment of Staff	97% (37)	89% (17)
"Useful" Assessment of Resources	95% (37)	80% (15)
"Useful" Assessment of Staff	97% (37)	84% (16)
	CT Refers to TLC	
	Frequently	Infrequently
"Favorable" Assessment of Resources	95% (38)	95% (21)
"Favorable" Assessment of Staff	95% (38)	95% (20)
"Useful" Assessment of Resources	95% (38)	77% (17)
"Useful" Assessment of Staff	95% (38)	81% (17)

TABLE XII

Total CT Usage by CT Assessments of TLC Resources and Staff

	Total Contacts with TLC	
	Frequent Users	Infrequent Users
"Favorable" Assessment of Resources	93% (26)	83% (5)
"Favorable" Assessment of Staff	92% (24)	100% (6)
"Useful" Assessment of Resources	82% (23)	67% (4)
"Useful" Assessment of Staff	85% (23)	83% (5)

Conclusions

The seventh question we originally proposed asked:

> How can the data gained from the previous questions be used to deepen understanding and to provide new directions for teachers' centers to more effectively support and meet coordinating teachers' needs and through them the needs of classroom teachers?

In short, not only did we propose to conduct a series of studies but we also proposed to resolve the seeming gap between research and practice. Certainly, the collaborative process entailed many discussions that focused around what these data might mean. Further, the collaborative research process also revealed that it is a mistake to assume that research data reveal direct and simple proposals for action. As Shackle (1966) argues:

> In everyday language and in that of the policy sciences, decision includes two quite contrasted meanings. Two contrasting psychic activities, two attitudes to life and two different types of mind are involved. There are truth-seekers and truth-makers. On the one hand, the pure scientist deems himself to be typically faced with a problem which has one right answer. His business is in the map-maker's language, to get a fix on that problem, to take bearings from opposite ends of a base-line and plot them to converge upon the solution, the truth-to-be-found. On the other hand, the poet-architect-adventurer sees before him a landscape inexhaustibly rich in suggestions and materials for making things, for making works of literature or art or technology, for making policies and history itself, or perhaps for making the complex, delicate, existential system called a business. (p.767).

Seemingly then, research to inform policy must inform problem-solving and not attempt to supplant it. It needs, at least in part, to inform policymaking as "originative" action (Shackle, 1966:767) -- an action that must take what is "known" by research and make something of it.

It is this understanding of the gap and the bridge between research and practice that we believe is the most valuable outcome of a collaborative research process.

Of course, we learned from each other. The collaboration of university personnel, TLC staff, area coordinating teachers, and school coordinating teachers taught all of us more about one another's functioning and led to a heightened mutual respect. The collaboration over design of the project enabled a truer match of research problem and method than would ever have been possible otherwise. The collaborative data collection allowed not only an exchange of skills, but also of insight. The collaborative data analysis led area CTs to take "time-outs" to discuss the implications for their own somewhat similar roles as well as how to more effectively work with school CTs and also led the research team of TLC and UNC staff to find a camaraderie in our early ignorance and gratification in our later understanding. As exciting and productive as all this was, however, the true joy of collaborative research was found in the intellectual exchange of researcher and practitioner as we attempted to use our respective concepts and constructs to explore what we sought to explain. It was then that we understood and respected the gap between research and practice and lost our reticence to attempt to bridge it via dialogue. Reflective research and reflective practice are the best outcomes that any project could have.

Conceptual understanding of the problem of informing practice with research and the gains obtained in the collaborative process, however, still does not isolate the issues that need to be "anticipated" and fashioned into "originative" action. This study has revealed many issues of interest for the TLC. While certainly not the intent of this research, the TLC can be heartened by the finding that it is one of the most valuable resources to the coordinating teacher in performing his/her job. It provides materials, ideas and professional development for a role that is complex, demanding, and broadly defined. Further, this job-related support is also significant emotional support for persons in such a role.

However, usage of the TLC is not uniform among CTs. In fact, usage seems to be systematically affected both by role perception and school context, which interact with each other. CTs have many dimensions to their role and certainly must fulfill both advising and managerial responsibilities. Yet some may seem to emphasize one of these areas of responsibility over others. Those who focus on advising responsibilities tend to emphasize direct support of the teacher in his/her instructional activity, and thus find the TLC an apt resource for both materials and strategies for advising. Those who focus on managerial responsibilities tend to work through school committees and lines of authority to aid instruction. This focus on coordinative functions is not related to TLC usage and reasonably so, for their perception does not include extensive resource procurement for teachers.

Of course, all CTs must accomplish both advising and managerial responsibilities. Yet school context seems to influence and reinforce which set of responsibilities should be emphasized. The CTs tend to be advisors in schools where teachers and the principal expect the CT to be primarily an advisor and support to teachers in an effort to improve instruction, as in many elementary schools. Similarly, the CTs tend to be managers in schools where teachers and the principal expect the CT to be primarily a manager of curriculum, as in many secondary schools. While this may seem obvious, its implications are far-reaching for the TLC.

The effects of role perception and school context yield mixed reviews for the TLC. As one CT said:

> It's (the TLC) of value... And it's not of great value. I think in terms of what the TLC is trying to do for the entire school system, it's of great value. I think the way it's oriented is fine. The only things they need that they might improve on is a little more orientation toward secondary. But I understand the reason that is not as much a priority -- it's your elementary teachers who come and want the make and take. They are responding to the need that they see.

To some, this quote may suggest both an evident problem and an evident solution: the TLC is not sufficiently serving the secondary schools and should do so. However, expanding the TLC to respond more to secondary teachers and coordinating teachers is not the evident solution it seems. First, it involves either additional resources or a redirection of resources Additional resources in an era of scarcity are not easily obtained and redirection to secondary school needs means potentially jeopardizing the TLC's seeming effective support of elementary teachers and advising CTs. Second, it assumes that the TLC's mission is correctly conceived as serving all teachers and coordinating teachers, regardless of their perception of need for TLC services. The TLC's emphasis on volunteer use, of course, precludes usage that is coerced, at least on a major scale. The TLC also utilizes a staff development approach to provide its service. The TLC staff works with the teachers so that the teachers identify their own needs. In doing so they attempt to support the teacher in developing her/his role and increasing his/her awareness of the resources of CMS. Thus as long as secondary schools and CTs who focus primarily on managerial responsibilities perceive little need, it is unlikely that changes in the TLC will lead effectively to serving all teachers. The goal of serving all teachers has an additional dimension to be considered. It is essential to understand that the TLC is not the only staff development resource in CMS. The inservice team, the curriculum research center, the curriculum specialists, other coordinating teachers, and the principals are all resources to the coordinating teachers and not all serve elementary and secondary schools in the same ways or to the same extent. The TLC's bookstore, machines, and recycle materials are used by the secondary school teachers and coordinating teachers, and thus the TLC cannot be viewed as overlooking the secondary schools' needs. Further, the TLC Advisory has a special committee focused on secondary schools' needs, promoting exchange among secondary school teachers.

The third issue with the "evident" solution of expanding the TLC services to more effectively serve secondary schools and CTs with a managerial orientation is

that both the "evident" problem and the "evident" solution reflect larger concerns with the legitimacy conferred on the TLC by CMS. That is to say, if the TLC's services were viewed a appropriate both in extent and direction, the search for new users would not be of concern. Since the TLC seems to be about authenticity (what teachers want) and not directly about legitimacy (what persons in authority want teachers to do), it is likely that persons in authority may not fully perceive its usefulness. Yet this is not to say that the TLC does not aid the interests of persons in authority for it does. While it does not necessarily prompt strict compliance on the part of teachers, it attempts to develop a capability on the part of teachers to be more professional, self-sustaining, supportive of one another, and reflective. In this way, the TLC supplements the rational authority of the line in CMS with the intellectual and ideological authority of the profession.

Thus the evident problem and solution seem not to be a simple expansion of TLC services f that is the case, then how is the problem to be conceived and what solution should be preferred? One approach, and certainly a reasonable one, is to conclude that there is no problem and thus no solution is required. The TLC does provide some services for both managerial and advising responsibilities of CTs and to both elementary and secondary schools . Moreover, CMS has a range of services that seemingly assist the CT in managerial responsibilities. Thus there may be no problem at all.

Another approach would be to conclude that the primary problem of the TLC is the essential problem of staff development in the public schools (Schlechty, 1982). That is to say, since school systems have not fully legitimated the staff development function it is unlikely that the TLC will be able to overcome this state of affairs. Politically, however, the TLC cannot simply resign itself to this. The prudent solution to this definition of the problem is to seek legitimacy. This would include catering and/or tailoring services for the managerial CT and/or

secondary schools, but assessing goal attainment not in terms of usage but in terms of the legitimacy accorded to TLC affairs. Thus the TLC's emphasis on authenticity would be accorded legitimacy.

The third approach to defining the problem and solution is to take the results of this study at their face value. Since role perception and school context affect usage, the TLC may well wish to work to alter each. The TLC could work with the area coordinating teachers and school coordinating teachers to help define the role more in terms of advising and to link TLC resources to the role dimensions appropriate to those responsibilities. Additionally, the TLC could give further emphasis to the coordinative and indirect assistance of the managerial dimension of the CT role. The TLC could also attempt to alter secondary schools and their approaches to instruction and instructional support. It could foster a more developmental approach for the secondary school, for example. In any of these cases, however, it is important to realize that this conception of the problem and solution suggests the TLC should consider arenas not normally in the TLC's purview. Thus this solution would expand the TLC's effect not only in terms of resource utilization but also in terms of its effect on the nature of teaching.

The results of this study, then, can be used in many alternative ways. It may be likely that the TLC can find it advisable to move on more than one front at a time and thus advance many definitions of the problem and of the solution. This latter tack may be the safest, if nothing else. However, the advice of this research team, both to the TLC and coordinating teachers or to other Teachers' Centers and advising teachers, is to remember that while the ideas from this study may be generalizable, every situation has its unique features and that things change. The prime use of these results, we would argue, is to promote reflection for those involved with Teachers' Centers and advisors and the interrelationships of both.

Reflective practice is the most desirable outcome of applied collaborative research.

Implications for Teachers' Centers and Advisors

Given our conceptual understanding of the difference between truth-seeking (research) and truth-making (practice), we obviously believe that the implications of these findings are best found in creative thoughts of the various readers. However, we see at least five implications that we would share, since CTs have many characteristics of the advisor role and the TLC is similar to other teachers' centers.

First, it is important to understand the teachers' center and its services within the total context of staff development within a system and the other available supports, bo formal and informal, to the advisor role. We believe that teachers' centers are sufficiently unique and valuable in their uniqueness. This uniqueness seemingly is apparent and worthwhile to advisors. However, if CMS' experience is any guage, it is likely that adviso within a school do considerably more than provide direct classroom support to teachers. For these other functions, the teachers' center may or may not be the appropriate support.

Second, and related, it is important for the teachers' center to understand what goals the advisors are trying to accomplish. The variety of functions attached to the advising role may make the advisor approach the teachers' center and its various resources much as a researcher -- skeptical and detached. This does not mean the teachers' center is not valued. The advisor simply is trying to match resources with the needs he/she has identified in the school. Further, the variety of functions in the advising role seemingly makes it imperative for the teachers' center to carefully understand what <u>really</u> is being sought -- advice, materials, problem-solving, support, etc.

Third, the variety of functions and resource needs of an advisor requires the brokering service often offered by teachers/ centers. Advisors may not find this service available elsewhere in the school system. Other school

officials seem to help with role definition, legitimate the performance of the role and give support. They may not be able to broker the advisor to people and resources with the specificity that is needed.

Fourth, many things may affect how an advisor performs and these need to be understood if the teachers' center is to be of assistance. This study revealed that role perception, both by self and others, and school context have significant effects. Advising may be facilitated or hampered by variations in both. Further, if the teachers' center is to be able to effectively perceive and respond to the advisor's needs, both the formal definition and the functional implementation of the role need to be explored and understood.

Finally, and we hope obviously, it is important to remember that the advisor may need extensive support -- even though he/she may request it almost solely as professional development. The role, as implemented, is much more complex than the advising literature would lead one to believe. Without a body of literature that reflects this complexity, teachers' centers can be a viable source of solace and guidance to the advisor's role of supporting teachers.

References

Herriott, R. and N. Gross

1979 The Dynamics of Planned Educational Change. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Mannheim, K.

1936 Ideology and Utopia. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World.

Metz, M.

1978 Classrooms and Corridors. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Meyer, J. and B. Rowan

1978 "The Structure of Educational Organizations" in M. Meyer et al. (eds.), Environments and Organizations. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 1978.

Montgomery, M. et al.

1981 Principals' Relationship to Teachers' Centers. Report submitted to the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development.

Noblit, G.

1981 "The Holistic Alternative in Policy Research". The High School Journal 65: 2, pp. 43-49.

Patton, M.

1981 Qualitative Evaluation Research. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Schlechty, P. et al.

1981 The Organization and Management of Staff Development in a Large City School System. Final report of contract no. 400-79-0056 with the National Institute of Education.

Shackle, G.

1966 "Policy, Poetry and Success". The Economic Journal, (December), pp. 755-767.

Appendix A

Interview Questions

Introduction

I. Scope of the Job

A. Realizing that the list of duties your job demands is almost endless, could you share with us some of the major responsibilities you have in a "typical" school year?

B. In carrying out these responsibilities, let's talk for a while about your relationships with others in the school environment. Let's consider:

1. Teacher/SCT
2. Counselor/SCT
3. Student/SCT
4. Parent/SCT
5. Staff/School Secretary/SCT
6. Media Specialist/SCT
7. Other SCT's within the feeder area/SCT
8. Assistant Principal/SCT
9. Principal/SCT

C. To probe a little further, let's look at the dynamics of the Teacher/SCT relationship.

1. What services do teachers most often request from you? (Consider both professional requests and requests for informal support.)

2. In what ways are contacts initiated between you and one of your teachers?

3. What techniques do you employ to gain entrance to a classroom?

4. Are there any special "tricks of the trade" you use to help a teacher who is reluctant to ask for help or who may even be defensively on guard?

5. What personal skills/expertise do you draw upon when working with teachers?

6. In what ways do you deal with the wide range of requests for services you receive in a school year?

a. How do you find the resources needed by your teachers?

b. What sources have you found to be most helpful in supporting teachers?

c. What are some limits in your search for resources?

E. Let's focus our attention now on some specific aspects of your job as school coordinating teacher.

1. At this time, what do you find to be the most challenging aspects of your job?

2. What are the most comfortable tasks that you do? On the other hand, what are the most "uncomfortable" responsibilities with which you're faced?

3. By what personal criteria do you judge whether or not your effort with a project is "productive?"

4. How do you get feedback as to your success or lack of success in a project?

5. Recognizing that your job requires your constant support of others, what kinds of support are important to you to help you with your job? Where do you go to get this support?

6. In looking at the position you hold in your school, could you make some distinctions between activities/roles which you see are more appropriate in your domain and those which are less appropriate? Do you think others have a similiar point of view?

7. In a position that is relatively new, one would expect changes to take place over time in both job definition and personal adaptation to the role.

a. Can you tell us about changes you have noticed in your professional role over the length of your employment?

b. Would you share with us any personal changes you've noticed in yourself which may relate to your work as a SCT?

II. Limitations of the Job

A. What are the major limiting factors which interfere with your accomplishing objectives you feel are important?

B. Once again, recognizing the many demands placed upon you, what steps do you take when you receive a request that falls outside your area of expertise? (Who do you call when you don't know where to begin?)

C. What are some sources of help/support, which are not available at present, that would help you with your work?

D. Let's dream for a minute. If you had the power to do so, what changes would you make in your job in order for you to be more effective?

III. TLC Usage

A. In what ways, if any, do you use the TLC in your role as SCT?

1. What are some factors which may limit your use of the TLC?

2. Do you ever seek resources at the TLC for a particular faculty member? If so, do you go to the TLC for that teacher or do you recommend the teacher go directly to the TLC?

3. Do you see yourself using the TLC in different ways than classroom teachers? If so, what ways do you use it differently? On the other hand, what ways is your usage similar to that of the classroom teacher?

4. Do you ever contact TLC staff members by telephone rather than making a personal visit? If so, for what types of request do you use the telephone?

5. Is there a particular TLC staff member that you seek out for information/advice?

6. In your work as a SCT, what TLC activities/resources are most helpful to you?

7. What are the various perceptions of the TLC by others?

B. Is the TLC of particular value in your individual school? If so,in what ways? If not, for what reasons?

C. Do you promote TLC usage among faculty members? If so, how?

D. Do teachers in your school use the TLC? If so, for what purposes?

1. What are your teachers' perceptions of the TLC? (What comments have you heard?)

2. What do you think are the reasons for these perceptions?

3. How does your principal perceive the TLC? Is he/she supportive of the concept, moderately supportative or disinterested? In what ways is this support or lack of support shown?

4. In your opinion, does his/her perception affect teacher usage? If so, how?

5. What TLC resources/activities seem to be most helpful to your faculty members? (Specific Examples)

6. What are some factors which may limit your teachers' use of the TLC?

7. Are TLC services/activities adequately communicated such that teachers know that the resources exist? How are these services/ activities communicated?

8. Are you or your faculty members ever referred to the TLC by other staff members?

9. Is there a particular "type" of teacher who uses the TLC more than others? (EMR, TMR, EH, Bilingual, Exceptional Students, etc.,?)

9. What would encourage non-users to take advantage of these services?

10. How do you think the TLC is perceived by teachers at grade levels other than your own? (elementary, jr. high, sr. high?)

IV. TLC Changes

A. What changes in the TLC would enable you to use these services more effectively?

B. What changes in the TLC would enable your teachers to use these services more effectively?

C. What TLC services are not offered which might be beneficial to professional staff?

D. In your opinion, how does the TLC fit into the total staff development program?

E. For your purposes, and for those of your teachers, describe the perfect TLC.

Appendix B

TO: School Coordinating Teachers

FROM: Deane Crowell, Asst. Supt./Human Resources
George Noblit, U.N.C.-Chapel Hill
Carol Newman, Teaching Learning Center

RE: Teaching Learning Center Research Project

As you may know, the Teaching Learning Center has been conducting a study funded by the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, San Francisco, California. The purpose of the research is to help the Teaching Learning Center better support the coordinating teacher. To this end we are conducting a study of the usage of the Teaching Learning Center using the TLC's sign-in cards. Also we have interviewed school coordinating teachers from two areas to try to better understand the coordinating teacher role and how the Teaching Learning Center may support the coordinating teacher. Finally, we will analyze responses to the attached questionnaire from all school coordinating teachers in the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools. The design of the questionnaire is based on what has been learned from the TLC Usage Study and the coordinating teacher interviews. Since we expect variability in types of schools and in coordinating teacher roles, some of the questions are open-ended while others have structured responses.

The questionnaire is to be sealed in the attached envelope and returned to your area office. The sealed questionnaires will then be mailed to George Noblit at UNC-Chapel Hill. The data will be coded, key punched, and computer analyzed in total confidentiality. No individuals are or will be identified as we are interested only in overall patterns. The final report will be available in the Teaching Learning Center (in January) for anyone interested in the results.

We know the questionnaire is but one more task in an all too busy day. We have attempted to keep it as brief as possible and still live up to the requirements of the research and the funding agency. It will take about 30 minutes to complete, and the results will be felt in more effective TLC programming.

If you have any questions, feel free to call Carol Newman at 332-2079 or the Teaching Learning Center at 376-0122. All questionnaires are due in your area office by Friday, October 16, 1981.

Thank you for your cooperation.

TEACHING LEARNING CENTER RESEARCH PROJECT QUESTIONNAIRE
CHARLOTTE-MECKLENBURG SCHOOLS

Directions: Please indicate or write in the appropriate responses. You may use the back of a page if given space is not enough.

A. Experience

1. Total years as a practicing educator _____
2. Total years of experience as a practicing educator in CMS _____
3. Including this year, total years as a coordinating teacher in CMS. 1 2 3
4. List the other positions you have held in education prior to becoming a coordinating teacher and the number of years you held each position starting with the most recent.

Position	No. of Years in Position
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

5. List in the categories below, the staff development/inservice activities in which you have served in a leadership role during the last five years.

   School _____

   Area/system _____

   Outside of system _____

6. Circle the number of schools for which you are responsible and indicate each school's grade levels. 1 2 grade levels _____ _____

B. Your Role

7. In your role as coordinating teacher, what three key objectives do you hope to accomplish this year. Please list in priority order (1=highest priority)

   1. _____
   2. _____
   3. _____

8. In your role as coordinating teacher, what three major expectations do others have for you this year? 1. _____

   2. _____
   3. _____

9. In terms of your own professional growth, what key areas will you focus on this year?

   _____

   _____

10. What specific skills do you find most useful in your work with teachers?

    _____

    _____

11. In a typical week, what percentage of your contacts with teachers in your school(s) are:

    _____% initiated by the teacher

    _____% initiated by you

    _____% initiated by someone other than you or a teacher (e.g. area CT, principal,etc

    100 %

12. In a typical week, how many times do you work with a teacher while he/she is involved in instructing students? _____

13. Below is a list of tasks related to your role. Check which tasks you use to:

a. establish/maintain credibility
b. accomplish assigned duties
c. foster teacher development
d. foster your self-renewal

Some tasks may require multiple checks. If a task is not applicable, do not check any of the columns.

Tasks	Establish Credibility	Assigned Duties	Teacher Development	Self-Renewal
Problem solving				
Locating materials and resources				
Sharing materials and resources				
Connecting people with people				
Producing and developing materials				
Doing school inservice				
Doing area/system inservice				
Attending system-sponsored inservice				
Using curriculum research library				
Using the TLC staff				
Using the TLC resources				
Consulting with specialists				
Coordinating school activities				
Providing emotional support				
Observing in classrooms				
Developing/adapting curriculum				
Giving demonstration lessons				
Serving on school committees				
Performing routine school tasks(buses,etc.)				
Working with students				
Working with department chairpersons				
Maintaining a resource room				
Working with parents				
Listening/counseling				
Implementing school/system-wide programs				
Being an ombudsman/liaison				
Other, please specify				

14. Indicate which of the following resource(s) you use for

a. Ideas
b. Materials
c. Your own professional/personal development
d. Emotional support

by checking the appropriate column(s). Each resource may have checks in more than one column.

Resources	Ideas	Materials	Your Professional Development	Emotional Support
Area Superintendent				
Area coordinating teacher				
Other school coordinating teachers				
Principal				
Curriculum specialists				
School media specialists				
School counselors				
School support staff				
Other school staff				
Teachers				
Aides				
Curriculum Research Library				
Staff Development Center workshops				
TLC staff				
TLC resources				
Professional conferences				
College/university contacts				
Parents				
Community resources				
Family				
Other, please specify				

C. Teaching Learning Center Usage

15. In a typical school month, how often do you:

Go to the TLC _____

Call the TLC _____

Refer someone to the TLC _____

16. What factors limit your use of the TLC? _____

_____

17. For what purposes do you go, call, or refer someone to the TLC? List the purposes individually and indicate the area(s) of responsibility to which they relate. More than one column may be checked.

Purposes for Calling, Going, Referring	Areas of Responsibility		
	Establish Credibility	Teacher Development	Self-Renewal

(Circle the appropriate responses to the next two questions)

18. Do you:

a. Use the TLC resources?	1	2	3	4
b. Use the TLC staff?	1	2	3	4
	frequently			infrequently
c. Perceive the TLC resources?	1	2	3	4
d. Perceive the TLC staff?	1	2	3	4
	favorably			unfavorably
e. Assess the TLC resources?	1	2	3	4
f. Assess the TLC staff?	1	2	3	4
	useful			not useful

19. Does your faculty:

a. Use the TLC resources?	1	2	3	4
b. Use the TLC staff?	1	2	3	4
	frequently			infrequently
c. Perceive the TLC resources?	1	2	3	4
d. Perceive the TLC staff?	1	2	3	4
	favorably			unfavorably
e. Assess the TLC resources?	1	2	3	4
f. Assess the TLC staff?	1	2	3	4
	useful			not useful

20. What improvements could be made in the TLC to encourage greater classroom teacher use?

_____

_____

21. What improvements could be made in the TLC to help you in your job as a coordinating teacher?

_____

_____

D. Career Information

22. Highest degree held at present

BA/BS _____ Masters _____ 6th Yr. Advanced _____ Doctorate _____

This degree was awarded in what major field _____

23. Are you working at present on an advanceddegree or additional certification?

Yes _____ No _____

24. List all North Carolina certification areas held at present _____

_____

_____

25. Check the one professional area in which you have the most career interest at this time.

Staff Development _____ Curriculum Specialist _____

Administration _____ Classroom Teaching _____

Consultant _____ College Teaching _____

Other, please specify _____